IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

HUNTINGTON DIVISION

JAMES W. BERRY, SR.,

v.

Petitioner,

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:07-00030

DAVID BALLARD, Warden, Mt. Olive Correctional Complex,

Respondent.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on review of the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations that Petitioner's application for habeas corpus relief filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 be denied. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), the Court referred this matter to United States Magistrate Judge Maurice G. Taylor, Jr. for submission to the Court of his Findings and Recommendation. The Magistrate Judge submitted his report on December 5, 2008. Thereafter, on December 10, 2008, Petitioner submitted objections to the Findings and Recommendation. Upon *de novo* review of Petitioner's objections, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **INCORPORATES** herein the Findings and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and **DENIES** Petitioner's request for relief.

In the Findings and Recommendation, Judge Taylor found Petitioner's "Writ" and "Amended Writ of Prohibition" are actually habeas corpus petitions pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The Magistrate Judge further found that Petitioner previously filed a habeas corpus petition pursuant to § 2254 in 2001, and he had not sought authorization to file a successive petition as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A). In his objections, Petitioner asserts, inter alia, he has a constitutional right to

file his action because he is illegally incarcerated. Upon de novo review, the Court agrees with the

Magistrate Judge. The Court finds that Petitioner's "Writ" and "Amended Writ of Prohibition" are aptly

characterized as a successive motion arising § 2254. As Petitioner has not received permission to file

a successive motion, this Court may not consider Petitioner's claims.

Petitioner also objects to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation that a number of other

motions be denied. See Order [Doc. No. 23]. The Court has reviewed the motions and agrees with the

Magistrate Judge. Similarly, the Court **DENIES** Petitioner's more recent motions for restraining orders.

[Doc. Nos. 24 & 28].

For the reasons set forth above, the Court ACCEPTS and INCORPORATES herein

the Findings and Recommendation filed on December 5, 2008, and **DENIES** Petitioner's request for

relief. The Court also **DENIES** Petitioner's motions for restraining orders. The Court **DIRECTS** the

Clerk to send a copy of this Order to Magistrate Judge Taylor, all counsel of record, and any

unrepresented parties.

ENTER:

March 19, 2009

ROBERT C. CHAMBERS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

-2-